



Re: [Tim V's notes from conversation with G. Bobker]: Fw: Agency / NGO meeting on Lower SJR SED - 11 AM on Feb 1 in Sacramento

Valentina Cabrera-Stagno to: Tim Vendlinski, Erin Foresman, Tom Hagler

02/01/2013 01:00 PM

(b) (5) deliberative

--Valentina

Valentina Cabrera Stagno  
Environmental Scientist  
US EPA Region IX  
Watersheds Office  
ph: 415.972.3434

Tim Vendlinski

Thanks for flagging this meeting, Erin; you kept...

01/30/2013 10:45:24 AM

From: Tim Vendlinski/R9/USEPA/US  
To: Erin Foresman/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Valentina Cabrera-Stagno/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 01/30/2013 10:45 AM  
Subject: [Tim V's notes from conversation with G. Bobker]: Fw: Agency / NGO meeting on Lower SJR SED - 11 AM on Feb 1 in Sacramento

Thanks for flagging this meeting, Erin; you kept me from looking like a fool when G. Bobker asked me about the Friday meeting with NGOs when we met for lunch yesterday before the SJR Tribs meeting.

I promised Valentina that I'd relay the following thoughts from G. Bobker that he shared with me at lunch before the Tribs meeting (my apologies if not everything is accurate in this hurried transcription):

**1. Concerns with the "Other":** The State Board appears ready to establish a flow range of 25-45% (UIF?) for inflows from the lower SJR that are tenuously linked to the adaptive management of the riverine system to reach narrative objectives for "other" habitat improvements. Apparently, the State Board has not defined what these "other" improvements might be (e.g., improved fish passage), and TBI is concerned that if the State Board finds it unfeasible/impracticable to make these other improvements, then it would be pointless to increase flow levels when beneficial uses are unattainable anyway.

**2. Vague & Weak Narrative Objectives ?:** From TBI's perspective, the narrative objectives being considered by the State Board are unnecessarily vague and weak, and they need to link narrative objectives with measurable biocriteria. The salmon doubling goal was a step in the right direction, but the Board appears to be backtracking on this goal.

Note & question from Tim: At the SJR Tributaries meeting, Gary or John Cain expressed the need for advancing specific targets for reproduction and survival of salmonids (e.g., achieving a resilient distribution of age classes). Would these be useful examples of measurable biocriteria we could recommend to the Board?

**3. Capping Flow Contributions from the SJR :** The State Board appears ready to "cap" total average inflows to the Delta at 35% during Phase 1 no matter what WQS are ultimately set for the Delta during Phase 2. This places a lot of pressure on NGOs and regulatory agencies to make sure the State Board

makes the best decisions for protecting beneficial uses during Phase 1 because the decisions made during the first phase will not be re-opened and adjusted later. From TBI's perspective, this continues to place an undue reliance on water from the Sacramento River basin for meeting WQ objectives in the Delta (and might not address the discontinuity of SJR water in the lower river caused by the import of water from the Sacramento River).

Erin Foresman

FYI \*\*\*\*\*...

01/28/2013 09:19:49 AM